



**EL DORADO COUNTY PLANNING SERVICES  
2850 FAIRLANE COURT  
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667**

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

<b>Project Title:</b> A06-0003/Z05-0008/PD05-0005/TM05-1400/P05-0014/ S05-0017, Cameron Park Congregate Care			
<b>Lead Agency Name and Address:</b> El Dorado County, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667			
<b>Contact Person:</b> Lisa Burke, AICP, Senior Planner		<b>Phone Number:</b> (530) 621-5355	
<b>Property Owner's Name and Address:</b> Cameron Park Ventures, 2452 Bay View Avenue, Carmel, CA. 93923-9119			
<b>Project Applicant/Agent's Name and Address:</b> Erik Pilegaard, 2452 Bay View Avenue, Carmel, CA. 93923-9119			
<b>Project Engineer's Name and Address:</b> Carlton Engineering, 883 Ponderosa Drive, Shingle Springs, CA. 95682			
<b>Project Architect's Name and Address:</b> Borges Architectural Group, 1508 Eureka Road, #150, Roseville, CA 95661			
<b>Project Location:</b> Terminus of Gabbert Drive, 1/4 mile north of the intersection with Palmer Drive, in the Cameron Park area.			
<b>Assessor's Parcel No(s):</b> 083-350-43			
<b>Zoning:</b> Estate Residential - 10 acres (RE-10)			
<b>Section:</b> 2 and 3 <b>T:</b> 9N <b>R:</b> 9E			
<b>General Plan Designation:</b> Multifamily Residential (MFR), High Density Residential (HDR), Commercial (C)			
<b>Description of Project:</b> General Plan Amendment to modify the boundary between MFR (Multi-family Residential) and C (Commercial) land use designations (Exhibit A); rezone from RE-10PD (Estate Residential Ten Acre Planned Development) and to C-PD (Commercial Planned Development) and R2-PD (Limited Multi-family Residential Planned Development),(Exhibit B); tentative Map to create 64 duets and three large lots; and special use permit for a community care facility. Development Plan to allow a 35 room Alzheimer's unit, 140 units of congregate care, and 64 duet cottages to house approximately 325 residents, along with an 8,000 square foot clubhouse.			
<b>Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:</b>			
	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>General Plan</u>	<u>Land Use</u> (e.g., Single Family Residences, Grazing, Park, School)
Site:	RE10-PD	MFR, HDR, C	Undeveloped
North:	RE-10	OS	Cameron Park Ecological Preserve
East:	RE-5	MFR, MDR	Undeveloped
South:	R2, C	MFR, C	Marshall Medical Center, Offices, Assisted Living Facilities
West:	R1, RM	HDR, MFR	Single Family Residences
<b>Briefly Describe the environmental setting:</b> Hilly terrain with slopes trending down in a northwesterly direction. Vegetation consists of mixed chaparral with sporadic oaks and grey pine. A relatively dense grove of grey pine grows within the southern portion of the parcel. A dry stream channel could be seen at the southern end of the parcel adjacent to the Marshall Medical Center.			
<b>Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):</b> Building Department: Building permit. Environmental Management: Medical HazMat Waste permit. Department of Transportation: CIP programmed and funded for Cameron Park Drive/Hwy 50/Palmer Drive interchange or project-specific, bid-ready improvement package submitted by applicant prior to Phase II development; Grading and Encroachment permits.			

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
<b>X</b>	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance		

**DETERMINATION**

**In the basis of this initial evaluation:**

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described in attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects: a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, pursuant to applicable standards; and b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: July 17, 2006

Printed Name: Lisa Burke, AICP, Senior Planner For: El Dorado County

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

- b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.1</b>	<b>AESTHETICS</b> Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The project area consists of commercial land uses nearby including the Goldorado Shopping Center and Marshall Medical Center. The project would involve construction of a 140-unit congregate care facility with a 35 patient Alzheimer Care building and 64 duet congregate care garden cottages.

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

- a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

There are no identified scenic vistas within or in the vicinity of the project site; therefore, the proposed project would have no substantial adverse effects on a scenic vista.

- b) *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

No scenic resources are located in the project area, and no roadway in the adjacent area is designated as a state scenic highway. The nearest scenic highway designation is on U.S. Highway 50 between and within the City of Placerville and the Tahoe Basin. This designation occurs approximately 9.0 miles east of the proposed project area. As such, the project would not affect aesthetic resources within the proximity of a State scenic highway.

There are no identified historic buildings within or in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would not impact any nearby historic buildings or historic resources.

There are no identified rock outcroppings within or in the vicinity of the project site. Rock outcroppings are not normally found in the area, and the project would not affect rock outcroppings within the project site. The project would require the removal of approximately 37 trees (23 live oaks, 13 grey pines, and 1 Freemont cottonwood). According to County guidelines, the ratio of removal to replacement of trees is 1:1. The preliminary landscape proposes planting hundreds of trees, in particular the planting of approximately 62

interior live oaks on the project site, which achieves the County's 1:1 replacement policy. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse affect on any scenic resources.

- c) *Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

The proposed project vicinity consists of a shopping center and medical building located off Palmer Drive. The proposed project would be located at the terminus of Gabbert Drive 0.25 mi. north of the intersection with Palmer Drive. The addition of a community care facility would not significantly change the existing visual character of the project area. This is considered a less than significant impact to visual resources in the project area.

- d) *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

The project may include installation of lighting for buildings and parking lots. Lighting will be installed so as to ensure that light and glare do not escape the subject parcel onto neighboring parcels or into any established public street right-of-way. All on-site lighting will conform to Section 17.14.170 of the El Dorado County Code, and be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America's (IESNA) full cut-off designation. As such, the proposed improvements would not substantially increase or alter light and glare sources over existing levels, nor would it impact nighttime views; therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.2 AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The project area is located within the unincorporated portion of El Dorado County. The project area is approximately 68 acres with commercial and residential land uses nearby. No agricultural resources are present within the project area or in the areas immediately surrounding or adjacent to the parcel.

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

- a) *Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?*

No agricultural resources exist within or adjacent to the project area, therefore the project would result in no impact from agricultural conversion.

- b) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

No land zoned for agricultural uses exists within or adjacent to the project area. The proposed project would not disrupt agricultural activities, and does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

- c) *Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?*

Refer to discussions a) and b) above. The project would not directly or indirectly result in conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.3 AIR QUALITY</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

REGIONAL SETTING

The project is located within the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (EDCAQMD), which is located within the Mountain Counties Air Basin. The San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin and the Sacramento Valley Air Basin lay to the west, and the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin is located to the south.

Ozone, which is classified as a “regional” pollutant, often afflicts areas downwind of the original source of precursor emissions. Ozone can be easily transported by winds from a source area. Winds from the west transport ozone from the Bay Area and the Sacramento Valley Air Basin to the Sierra Nevada foothills. Ozone precursor transport depends on daily meteorological conditions such as wind speed and air temperature.

Other primary pollutants, CO, for example, may form high concentrations when wind speed is low. Cold temperatures and calm conditions increase the likelihood of a climate conducive to high, localized CO concentrations.

In the summer, air flowing into the Mountain Counties Air Basin from the Central Valley to the west transports ozone precursors and ozone generated in the Bay Area and the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys into the Mountain Counties Air Basin. These transported pollutants are largely responsible for exceeding state and federal ozone standards in the air basin.

### **Air Pollution Sources and Current Air Quality**

The EDCAQMD is responsible for the management of air pollutant emissions in El Dorado County. The District regulates air quality through its permit authority for most types of stationary emission sources, and through its planning and review activities for other sources.

Federal and California ambient air quality standards have been established for the following five critical pollutants: nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, and ozone. Ozone pollution is the most conspicuous type of air pollution, and is often characterized by visibility-reducing haze, eye irritation, and high oxidant concentrations (i.e., “smog”). Ozone is a pollutant of particular concern in El Dorado County and in the Sacramento Valley.

Particulate matter is another pollutant of concern in the Mountain Counties Air Basin. Particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter, commonly called PM<sub>10</sub>, and less than 2.5 microns in diameter, commonly called PM<sub>2.5</sub>, refers to substances that can be inhaled into lungs and can potentially cause serious health problems. Common particulate matter sources include construction and demolition activities, agricultural operations, burning, and traffic.

Additionally, of particular concern to El Dorado County is the presence and release of Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA). NOA can be present in serpentine rock, and, when the rock is broken or crushed, NOA may be released from the rock and become airborne, which may cause a health hazard. Serpentine rock is known to occur in the project region.

In general, there are five major sources of air pollutant emissions in the air basin, including motor vehicles, industrial plants, agricultural activities, construction activities, and residential burning activities. It is motor vehicles that account for a significant portion of regional gaseous and particulate emissions. Local large employers, such as industrial plants, can also generate substantial regional gaseous and particulate emissions. In addition, construction, agricultural activities, and the burning of wood in fireplaces for residential heat can generate significant temporary gaseous and particulate emissions (dust, ash, smoke, etc.).

Applicable Federal and State standards for each regulated pollution category is provided in **Table 1**. The applicable standard for each pollution category, for environmental documentation purposes (i.e., identification of significant impacts), is whichever are the more stringent of the Federal or State standards. Based on existing monitoring data located nearest the project site, El Dorado County and the Mountain Counties Air Basin are not in attainment for Federal ozone standards.

### Ozone Emissions

The most severe air quality problem in El Dorado County is the high level of ozone. Ozone can cause eye irritation and impair respiratory functions. Accumulations of ozone depend heavily on weather patterns and thus vary substantially from year to year. Ozone is produced in the atmosphere through photochemical reactions involving

reactive organic compounds (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>). Numerous small sources throughout the region are responsible for most of the ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions in the Basin.

**TABLE 1  
FEDERAL AND STATE AIR QUALITY STANDARDS**

<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Averaging Time</b>	<b>Federal Standard</b>	<b>State Standard</b>
Ozone	1-Hour	0.12 ppm	0.09 PPM
	8-Hour	0.08 ppm	--
Carbon Monoxide	1-Hour	35.0 ppm	20.0 ppm
	8-Hour	9.0 ppm	9.0 ppm
Nitrogen Dioxide	Annual	0.05 ppm	--
	1-Hour	--	0.25 ppm
Sulfur Dioxide	Annual	0.03 ppm	--
	24-Hour	0.14 ppm	0.05 ppm
	1-Hour	--	0.25 ppm
PM <sub>10</sub>	24-Hour	150 g/m <sup>3</sup>	50 g/m <sup>3</sup>
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Annual	15 g/m <sup>3</sup>	--
	24-Hour	65 g/m <sup>3</sup>	--
Lead	30-Day Avg.	--	1.5 g/m <sup>3</sup>
	Month Average	1.5 g/m <sup>3</sup>	--

*ppm = parts per million*  
*g/m<sup>3</sup> = Micrograms per Cubic Meter*

*Source: Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Guide to Air Quality Assessment, July 2004.*

Suspended PM<sub>10</sub> Emissions

PM<sub>10</sub> refers to particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter - those that can be inhaled and cause health effects. Common sources of particulate matter include demolition, construction activity, agricultural operations, traffic and other localized sources such as from fireplaces. Very small particulate of certain substances can cause direct lung damage, or can contain absorbed gases that may be harmful when inhaled.

Carbon Monoxide (CO)

Because CO is emitted primarily by motor vehicles and is non-reactive, ambient CO concentrations normally follow the spatial and temporal distributions of vehicular traffic. CO concentrations are also influenced by meteorological factors such as wind speed and atmospheric mixing. High levels of CO can impair the transport of oxygen in the bloodstream and thereby aggravate cardiovascular disease and cause fatigue, headaches, and dizziness.

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>)

The major sources of nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), essential to the formation of photochemical smog, are vehicular, residential, and industrial fuel combustion. NO<sub>2</sub> is the “whiskey brown” colored gas evident during periods of

heavy air pollution. NO<sub>2</sub> increases the risk of respiratory disease and irritation and may reduce resistance to certain infections.

### Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>)

The major source of sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) is the combustion of high-sulfur fuels for electricity generation, petroleum refining, and shipping. In humid atmospheres, sulfur oxides can react with vapor to produce sulfuric acid, a component of acid rain. SO<sub>2</sub> can irritate the lungs, damage vegetation and materials and reduce visibility.

### Lead (Pb)

Gasoline-powered automobile engines are a major source of airborne lead, although the use of leaded fuel is being reduced. Lead can cause blood effects such as anemia and the inhibition of enzymes involved in blood synthesis. Lead may also affect the central nervous and reproductive systems. Ambient lead levels have dropped dramatically as the percentage of motor vehicles using unleaded gasoline continues to increase.

### Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA)

NOA is prevalent in at least 44 of California's 58 counties. Asbestos is the name for a group of naturally occurring silicate minerals, and may be found in serpentine rock, the California State rock, other ultramafic rock, and volcanic rock. When rock containing NOA is broken or crushed, asbestos may be released from the rock and may become airborne, potentially causing a health hazard.

Asbestos can be found in outside ambient air and has historically been higher in urban areas. The levels of asbestos found in the ambient air and through transport (both resulting from the Earth's shedding, attrition from wear and tear of asbestos containing consumer goods, mining activities, and general disturbance in other areas of California) into and out of El Dorado County, and possibly globally, are not yet understood or defined.

El Dorado County AQMD has adopted an El Dorado County Naturally Occurring Asbestos Review Area Map, which identifies those areas more likely to contain NOA. The project area is not located within an area identified on the most recent NOA Review Area Map as being "More Likely to Contain Asbestos" within a quarter-mile buffer area of areas found or more likely to contain NOA, or found areas of NOA (July 22, 2005).

## **Air Quality Standards**

### Federal

The 1977 Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) required the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to identify National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) to protect public health and welfare. NAAQS have been established for the six criteria air pollutants. (These are included in **Table 1**)

In June of 1997, the EPA adopted new ozone and PM<sub>10</sub> standards. The EPA intends to phase out the 1 – hour ozone standard of 0.12 ppm and replace it with an 8-hour standard of 0.08 ppm. The EPA also adopted an additional standard for particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>).

Pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the Federal CAA, the EPA has classified air basins (or portions thereof) as either “attainment” or “non-attainment” for each criteria air pollutant, based on whether or not the NAAQS have been achieved.

### State

In 1988, the State of California passed the California Clean Air Act (CCAA, State 1988 Statutes, Chapter 1568) that established more stringent State ambient air quality standards, and set forth a program for their achievement. State air basins are established by the CARB. CARB implements State ambient air quality standards, as required in the

State CCAA, and cooperates with the Federal government in implementing pertinent sections of the Federal Clean Air Bill, Amendments. Further, CARB has responsibility for controlling stationary and mobile source air pollutant emissions throughout the State. Like its Federal counterpart, the CCAA designates areas as attainment or non-attainment, with respect to the CCAAQS.

Most of El Dorado County is in the CARB-designated Mountain Counties Air Basin (MCAB), except for that portion included in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin. In addition to the majority of El Dorado County, the MCAB includes Plumas, Sierra, Nevada, Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne, and Mariposa Counties, and all of Placer County, except that portion included in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin, and that portion included in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin.

**Attainment Status Designations**

In accordance with federal and state law, the CARB is required to designate areas of the state as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassified for ambient air quality standards. An "Attainment" designation for an area signifies that pollutant concentrations did not violate the standard for that pollutant in that area. A "Nonattainment" designation indicates that a pollutant concentration violated the standard at least once, excluding those occasions when a violation was caused by an exceptional event, as defined in the criteria. An "Unclassified" designation signifies that data do not support either an attainment or nonattainment status. Nonattainment areas are divided into moderate, serious, and severe air pollution categories, with increasingly stringent control requirements mandated for each category. The attainment status designations for the El Dorado County portion of the Basin are summarized in **Table 2**.

**TABLE 2  
ATTAINMENT STATUS DESIGNATIONS  
MOUNTAIN COUNTIES AIR BASIN/EL DORADO COUNTY PORTION**

<b>State Designation</b>	<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Federal Designation</b>
Nonattainment	Ozone – 1 Hour	Severe nonattainment
Unclassified	Carbon monoxide	Unclassified/attainment
Nonattainment	Particulate matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	Unclassified
Attainment	Nitrogen dioxide	Attainment
Attainment	Sulfur dioxide	Attainment
Attainment	Sulfates	No federal standard
Attainment	Lead (Particulate)	No designation
Attainment	Hydrogen sulfide	No federal standard
Unclassified	Visibility reducing particulates	Unclassified

*Source: El Dorado County AQMD 2002*

**Standards of Significance**

The EDCAQMD recognizes both qualitative and quantitative thresholds of significance for air quality.

Qualitative thresholds include:

- Land use conflicts and exposure of sensitive receptors.
- Compliance with District rules and regulations.
- Potential to generate nuisance odors.

Quantitative thresholds established by the El Dorado County AQMD are:

- A project results in new direct or indirect emissions of ozone precursors (ROG or NO<sub>x</sub>) in excess of 82 pounds per day.
- A project would cause or significantly contribute to a violation of the applicable ambient air quality standard for other criteria pollutants, including carbon monoxide, PM<sub>10</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and NO<sub>2</sub>.
- For toxic air contaminants (TAC) a lifetime probability of contracting cancer greater than one in one-million (10 in one-million if Toxic-Best Available Control Technology is utilized); or the ground level concentration of non-carcinogenic toxic air contaminants would result in a Hazard Index of greater than 1.

**Methodology**

Air quality impacts were analyzed in accordance with EDCAQMD recommended methodologies, as outlined in the EDCAQMD’s *CEQA Guide* (February 2002). Accordingly, short-term construction-generated exhaust emissions associated with the operation of onsite construction equipment were evaluated based on estimated fuel usage requirements. Fugitive dust emissions from project construction are based on incorporation of EDCAQMD-recommended control measures. Emissions of fugitive dust would be considered less than significant if the measures have been incorporated to prevent visible emissions beyond the boundaries of the project.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

The proposed project could result in a minor, temporary increase in ozone, PM<sub>10</sub>, carbon monoxide, reactive organic compounds, or nitrogen oxides due to the use of construction equipment. The EDCAQMD *CEQA Guide to Air Quality Assessment* sets forth the maximum daily fuel use for all construction equipment at a single site that would ensure that emissions remain below the 82 lbs/day significance threshold for ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. If fuel use is kept below the levels shown in **Table 3** on the peak equipment use day, ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from construction equipment would be considered less than significant.

**TABLE 3  
CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT FUEL USE SCREENING LEVELS**

<b>Equipment Age Distribution</b>	<b>Maximum Daily Fuel Use (GAL. PER DAY)</b>
All equipment 1995 model year or earlier	337
All equipment 1996 model year or later	402

*Assumptions: 12.5 g/hp-hr ROG+NO<sub>x</sub> for 1995 and earlier equipment (from EPA Nonroad Model); 10.5 g/hp-hr ROG+NO<sub>x</sub> for 1996 and later equipment (Based on EPA and CARB Tier 1 standards).*

*Notes: Determination of fuel use should be documented based on the equipment manufacturer’s data. Use linear interpolation between 337 and 402 gal. per day in proportion to distribution of equipment into the two age categories; e.g. 50/50 age distribution yields allowable fuel use of (337+ ((402-337)/2) or 370 gal. per day.*

If project-specific fuel use estimates are calculated to be less than those maximum volumes referenced in **Table 3**, and ROG and Nox emissions are considered less than significant above, then exhaust emissions of CO and PM<sub>10</sub> from construction equipment, and exhaust emissions of all constituents from worker commute vehicles, may also be deemed not significant.

At the time of the preparation of this initial study, detailed construction information (e.g., type of equipment, number of pieces of equipment, number of employees, etc.) was not available. Based upon a Traffic Impact Assessment performed February 7, 2005 by kdAnderson Transportation Engineers, the project will generate approximately 473 additional vehicle trips onto Cameron Park Drive daily. While this increase in traffic will result in short-term and long-term increases in mobile emission sources, under Table 5.2 of the Air Pollution Control District's CEQA Guide, the project size of 204 dwelling units is under the 230 dwelling unit level of potential significance that is likely to generate 82 pounds/day (lbs/day) of ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> per day. Therefore, regardless of the model year of the equipment used, construction activities associated with the proposed project would not be anticipated to exceed the EDCAQMD's significance thresholds of 82 pounds/day (lbs/day) for ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> and would be considered less than significant. Because estimated fuel use would not exceed EDCAQMD's screening-level thresholds and in accordance with EDCAQMD-recommended screening-level methodologies, localized concentrations of construction-generated exhaust emissions, including emissions of CO and diesel-exhaust PM, would, likewise, not be considered significant.

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct local, State or Federal air quality plans; therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts on air quality plans.

- b) *Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?*

Refer to response a) above. The proposed project would require the use of construction equipment for the proposed improvements. Construction activities, such as the use of heavy equipment that generate dust, exhaust, and tire-wear emissions and from paints and coatings, may increase the air pollutants in the area temporarily. The short-term occurrence of emissions may result in a minor, temporary increase in regional pollutants, such as ozone, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, reactive organic compound or nitrogen oxides.

Construction air quality impacts are generally attributable to dust generated by equipment and vehicles. Fugitive dust is emitted both during construction activity and as a result of wind erosion over exposed earth surfaces. Clearing and earth moving activities comprise a major source of construction dust emissions, but traffic and general disturbances of soil surfaces during construction can also generate significant dust emissions. Further, dust generation is dependent on soil type and soil moisture. Any grading that would occur as part of project construction would be subject to EDCAQMD's current Fugitive Dust Rule 223- General Requirements (amended July 19, 2005), and Rule 223.1-Construction Requirements, (adopted July 19, 2005) which include requirements for visible dust minimization within the project area and at the property line. In addition to the necessary compliance with the regulations identified above, the project site plans include specific and comprehensive dust and air pollution control measures that must be adhered to by the project contractor. Pursuant to the EDCAQMD guidelines, if fuel usage limits or other appropriate mitigation is applied to reduce ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>, or if the project would require the use of fewer than 10 diesel-burning vehicles/day, TAC-related impacts are considered less than significant.

As discussed above, project construction would create short-term increases in fugitive dust and vehicle and equipment operation. Base on the fuel-use screening criteria, these emissions would be considered less than significant.

- c) *Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?*

Refer to response a and b) above. While the project would generate short-term air quality impacts as a result of construction activities, the project would not result in long-term or cumulatively considerable increases in air quality pollutant emissions for which El Dorado County is currently in non-attainment (ozone precursors). The project would have a less than significant contribution to cumulative pollutant increases in the region.

- d) *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

See analysis under (a). "Sensitive receptors" include residences, schools, parks, hospitals, or other land uses where children or the elderly congregate, or where outdoor activity is the primary land use. A sensitive receptor evaluation was completed to comply with the El Dorado County General Plan (July 2004) Objective 6.7.6 concerning separation of air pollution sensitive land uses (senior housing) from significant sources of air pollution (U.S. Highway 50). The proposed project's southern boundary is approximately 1,000 feet north of U.S. Highway 50.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB), on page 10 in Chapter 1 of the CARB "2005 Air Quality and Land Use Handbook (Handbook) ARB Recommendations on Siting New Sensitive Land Uses" states: "Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 500 feet of a freeway, urban roads with 100,000 vehicles/day, or rural roads with 50,000 vehicles/day."

The CALTRANS 2004 annual average daily traffic count for U.S. Highway 50 at Cameron Park Drive is 63,000. The El Dorado County Department of Transportation average daily traffic count for Cameron Park Drive 200 yards south of Hacienda drive for 2004 was 21,000. Both are below the Handbook recommended ADT siting criteria.

Based upon the forgoing evaluation, there should be no adverse health effects from U.S. Highway 50 or the U.S. Highway 50 off-ramp at Cameron Park Drive from traffic emission for the residents at the proposed Cameron Park Congregate Care Facility and impacts related to substantial pollutants and sensitive receptor land uses are considered less than significant.

The project site is not within the Asbestos Review Area Map, developed by EDCAQMD. However, it is assumed that NOA may be present on the project site once site grading begins. It is also assumed that the NOA may be at levels that can be mitigated to a less than significant level by compliance with EDCAQMD regulations and El Dorado County Contract Standard Special Provisions, as approved by EDCAQMD. Specifically, measures found in Rule 223-2-Fugitive Dust – Asbestos Hazard Mitigation (adopted July 19, 2005) would be implemented, which include monitoring and mitigation that is standardized and approved by the AQMD. The applicable Best Available Control Measures listed in Tables 1 through 6 of Rule 223-2 would be implemented, including application of water or stabilizing agents to all disturbed soils on a regular basis to prevent the generation of visible dust, pre-watering soils prior to excavation, minimizing drop heights and emptying speeds from loader buckets to avoid dust plumes, hydroseeding, and limiting stockpile sizes among other measures.

In 2002 the California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopted an Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM) at Title 17 Section 93105. The standard addresses Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining activities. This ATCM identifies Construction as any activity that disturbs soil containing asbestos in concentrations of 0.25% or greater. The Construction ATCM also includes activities that disturb soil where asbestos building material debris or NOA may have been dumped or in areas that contain NOA.

Section 93105 adds another surface regulations for NOA and complements the existing Surfacing ATCM (Title 17 Section 93106) that was modified in 2001 to reflect the lowering of the allowable level of asbestos used in surfacing applications from 5% to 0.25%.

In accordance with the California Air Resources Board Final Regulation Order for Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations, Section 93105 (March 10, 2004), the Department of Transportation would notify the EDCAQMD Officer in writing at least 14 days prior to construction, and must implement dust control measures from Section 93105 in addition to the County regulations.

As stated above, El Dorado County AQMD has adopted an El Dorado County Naturally Occurring Asbestos Review Area Map, which identifies those areas more likely to contain NOA. The project area is not located within an area identified on the most recent NOA Review Area Map as being "More Likely to Contain Asbestos" within a quarter-mile buffer area of areas found, or more likely to contain NOA, or found areas of NOA (July 22, 2005). Therefore, it is assumed the project is not within an area likely to contain NOA, and

because it would comply with the regulations identified above, impacts related to NOA are considered less than significant.

e) *Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

Construction activities would involve the use of a variety of gasoline or diesel powered engines that emit exhaust fumes. However, these emissions would occur intermittently throughout the workday, and the exhaust odors would dissipate rapidly within the immediate vicinity of the equipment. While some persons who live or walk by the construction site may find these odors objectionable, the infrequency of the emissions, rapid dissipation of the exhaust into the air, and short-term nature of the construction activities would be considered a less than significant impact.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.4</b>	<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>	Would the project:			
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The project site is located within the western foothills of the Sierra Nevada. The project site is undeveloped hilly land with mostly chaparral vegetation. The elevation ranges from approximately 1,319 to 1,480 feet above sea level. The Cameron Park unit of the Pine Hill Preserve borders the project site on the north and east. The project site contains four biological communities, these being; gabbroic northern mixed chaparral; cattail wetland; red willow riparian forest, and channels. The primary biological community is gabbroic northern mixed chaparral.

**REGULATORY CONTEXT**

This section lists specific environmental review and consultation requirements and identifies permits and approvals that must be obtained from local, state, and federal agencies before construction of the proposed project.

Federal

**Endangered Species Act**

Provisions of the federal Endangered Species Act (FESA), as amended (16 USC 1531), protect federally listed threatened and endangered species and their habitats from unlawful take. “Take” under FESA includes activities such as “harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct.” The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s (USFWS) regulations define harm to include some types of “significant habitat modification or degradation.” The U.S. Supreme Court ruled on June 29, 1995, that “harm” may include habitat modification “...where it actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding or sheltering.”

For projects with a federal nexus, Section 7 of the FESA requires that federal agencies, in consultation with USFWS or NOAA Fisheries, use their authorities to further the purpose of FESA and to ensure that their actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or result in destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. Section 10(a)(1)(B) allows non-federal entities to obtain permits for incidental taking of threatened or endangered species through consultation with USFWS or NOAA Fisheries.

## **Clean Water Act, Section 404**

The objective of the Clean Water Act (CWA 1977, as amended) is to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters. Discharge of fill material into "waters of the U.S.," including wetlands, is regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) under Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act (33 USC 1251-1376). Corps regulations implementing Section 404 define "waters of the U.S." to include intrastate waters, including lakes, rivers, streams, wetlands, and natural ponds, the use, degradation or destruction of which could affect interstate or foreign commerce.

Wetlands are defined for regulatory purposes as "areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions" (33 CFR 328.3; 40 CFR 230.3). The placement of structures in "navigable waters of the U.S." is also regulated by the Corps under Section 10 of the federal Rivers and Harbors Act (33 USC 401 et seq.).

Projects are permitted under either individual or general (e.g., nationwide) permits. Specific applicability of permit type is determined by the Corps on a case-by-case basis.

In 1987 the Corps published a manual that standardized the manner in which wetlands were to be delineated nationwide. To determine whether areas that appear to be wetlands are subject to Corps jurisdiction (i.e., are "jurisdictional" wetlands), a wetlands delineation must be performed. Under normal circumstances, positive indicators from three parameters, (1) wetland hydrology, (2) hydrophytic vegetation, and (3) hydric soils must be present to classify a feature as a jurisdictional wetland. In addition to verifying wetlands for potential jurisdiction, the Corps is responsible for the issuance of permits for projects that propose filling of wetlands. Any permanent loss of a jurisdictional wetland as a result of project construction activities is considered a significant impact.

Sycamore Environmental Consultants) prepared a Jurisdictional Delineation Report (2005) for the project site. The report indicated that the total acreage of potential jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S. within the project area is 0.908 acre.

## **Migratory Bird Treaty Act**

Migratory birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 USC 703-711). The MBTA makes it unlawful to take, possess, buy, sell, purchase, or barter any migratory bird listed in 50 CFR Part 10, including feathers or other parts, nests, eggs, or products, except as allowed by implementing regulations (50 CFR 21). Project construction has the potential to directly take nests, eggs, young or individuals of these protected species. Further, construction disturbance during the breeding season could result in the incidental loss of fertile eggs or nestlings, or otherwise lead to the abandonment of nests, a violation of the MBTA.

## **Bald Eagle Protection Act**

The bald eagle and golden eagle are federally protected under the Bald Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668c). It is illegal to take, possess, sell, purchase, barter, offer to sell or purchase or barter, transport, export or import at any time or in any manner a bald or golden eagle, alive or dead; or any part, nest or egg of these eagles unless authorized by the Secretary of the Interior. Violations are subject to fines and/or imprisonment for up to one year. Active nest sites are also protected from disturbance during the breeding season.

## State

## **California Endangered Species Act**

Under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), CDFG has the responsibility for maintaining a list of endangered and threatened species (California Fish and Game Code 2070). CDFG maintains a list of "candidate species" which are species that CDFG formally notices as being under review for addition to the list of endangered or threatened species. CDFG also maintains lists of "species of special concern" which serve as species "watch

lists.” Pursuant to the requirements of CESA, an agency reviewing a proposed project within its jurisdiction must determine whether any state listed endangered or threatened species may be present in the project study area and determine whether the proposed project will have a potentially significant impact on such species. In addition, CDFG encourages informal consultation on any proposed project that may impact a candidate species.

Project-related impacts to species on the CESA endangered or threatened list would be considered significant. State listed species are fully protected under the mandates of the CESA. “Take” of protected species incidental to otherwise lawful management activities may be authorized under California Fish and Game Code Section 2081. Authorization from CDFG would be in the form of an Incidental Take Permit. The proposed project would require an incidental take permit issued to El Dorado County if the proposed project would result in the take of a state-listed species.

### **California Regional Water Quality Control Board**

#### *Clean Water Act, Section 401 Water Quality Certification/ Waiver*

The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) is responsible for enforcing water quality criteria and protecting water resources in association with the proposed project. The CVRWQCB is responsible for controlling discharges to surface waters of the state by issuing waste discharge requirements (WDR) or commonly by issuing conditional waivers to WDRs. The CVRWQCB requires that a project proponent obtain a Section 401 (Clean Water Act) water quality certification or waiver for Section 404 permits granted by the Corps.

For wetlands impacts totaling less than one (1) acre, the CVRWQCB typically issues a waiver, provided the applicant is also applying for a Streambed Alteration Permit from the CDFG. The CVRWQCB has 60 days to issue a waiver. For between one (1) and two (2) acres of wetland impacts, a waiver could also be issued, but only after thorough review by agency or public comments during the 40-day comment period on the Corps issue notice (if the Corps has required an individual permit). For more than two (2) acres of wetland removal, the CVRWQCB requires a mitigation plan, a public hearing, and approval of the water quality certification by the SWRCB.

A request for water quality certification (including WDRs) by the CVRWQCB and a Notice of Intent (NOI) application for a General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities should be prepared and submitted following completion of the CEQA environmental document and submittal of a formal (jurisdictional) wetland delineation to the Corps.

### **California Department of Fish and Game**

#### *Streambed Alteration Agreement (Sections 1600-1607 of the California Fish and Game Code)*

State and local public agencies are subject to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code, which governs construction activities that will substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake designated by the CDFG. Under Section 1602, a discretionary Stream Alteration Agreement permit from the CDFG (Region 2 for the proposed Project) must be issued by the CDFG to El Dorado County prior to the initiation of construction activities within lands under CDFG jurisdiction. As a general rule, this requirement applies to any work undertaken within the 100-year floodplain of a stream or river containing fish or wildlife resources.

#### *Native Plant Protection Act*

The Native Plant Protection Act (California Fish and Game Code Section. 1900-1913) prohibits the taking, possessing, or sale within the state of any plants with a state designation of rare, threatened, or endangered (as defined by CDFG). An exception to this prohibition in the Act allows landowners, under specified circumstances, to take listed plant species, provided that the owners first notify CDFG and give that state agency at least 10 days to come and retrieve (and presumably replant) the plants before they are plowed under or otherwise destroyed (Fish and Game Code, § 1913 exempts from “take” prohibition “the removal of endangered or rare native plants from a canal, lateral ditch, building site, or road, or other right of way”). Project impacts to these species are not

considered significant unless the species are known to have a high potential to occur within the area of disturbance associated with construction of the proposed project.

### *Birds of Prey*

Under Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code it is unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds in the orders of Falconiformes or Strigiformes (birds of prey) or to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto.

### *“Fully Protected” Species*

California statutes also accord “fully protected” status to a number of specifically identified birds, mammals, reptiles, and amphibians. These species cannot be “taken,” even with an incidental take permit. Section 3505 of the California Fish and Game Code makes it unlawful to “take” “any egret or egret, osprey, bird of paradise, gaura, numidi, or any part of such a bird.” Section 3511 protects from “take” the following “fully protected birds”: (a) American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*); (b) brown pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis*); (c) California black rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus*); (d) California clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris obsoletus*); (e) California condor (*Gymnogyps californianus*); (f) California least tern (*Sterna albifrons browni*); (g) golden eagle; (h) greater sandhill crane (*Grus canadensis tabida*); (i) light-footed clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris levipes*); (j) southern bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus leucocephalus*); (k) trumpeter swan (*Cygnus buccinator*); (l) white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*); and (m) Yuma clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris yumanensis*).

California Fish and Game Code Section 4700 identifies the following “fully protected mammals” that cannot be “taken”: (a) Morro Bay kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys heermanni morroensis*); (b) bighorn sheep (*Ovis canadensis*), except Nelson bighorn sheep (subspecies *Ovis canadensis nelsoni*); (d) Guadalupe fur seal (*Arctocephalus townsendi*); (e) ring-tailed cat (genus *Bassariscus*); (f) Pacific right whale (*Eubalaena sieboldi*); (g) salt-marsh harvest mouse (*Reithrodontomys raviventris*); (h) southern sea otter (*Enhydra lutris nereis*); and (i) wolverine (*Gulo gulo*).

Fish and Game Code Section 5050 protects from “take” the following “fully protected reptiles and amphibians”: (a) blunt-nosed leopard lizard (*Crotaphytus wislizenii silus*); (b) San Francisco garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia*); (c) Santa Cruz long-toed salamander (*Ambystoma macrodactylum croceum*); (d) limestone salamander (*Hydromantes brunus*); and (e) black toad (*Bufo boreas exsul*).

Fish and Game Code Section 5515 also identifies certain “fully protected fish” that cannot lawfully be “taken” even with an incidental take permit. The following species are protected in this fashion: (a) Colorado River squawfish (*Ptychocheilus lucius*); (b) thicketail chub (*Gila crassicauda*); (c) Mohave chub (*Gila mohavensis*); (d) Lost River sucker (*Catostomus luxatus*); (e) Modoc sucker (*Catostomus microps*); (f) shortnose sucker (*Chasmistes brevirostris*); (g) humpback sucker (*Xyrauchen texanus*); (h) Owens River pupfish (*Cyprinoden radiosus*); (i) unarmored threespine stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoni*); and (j) rough sculpin (*Cottus asperimus*).

### Local

#### 2004 El Dorado County General Plan

- In addition to federal and state regulations, the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan defines certain goals, objectives, and policies protecting natural resources:
- Objective 7.4.1 of the General Plan states that the County will protect state and federally recognized rare, threatened, or endangered species and their habitats consistent with federal and state laws.
- Policy 7.4.1.1 - The County shall continue to provide for the permanent protection of the eight sensitive plant species known as the Pine Hill endemics and their habitat through the establishment of ecological preserves

consistent with County Code Chapter 17.71 and the USFWS’s Gabbro Soil Plants for the Central Sierra Nevada Foothills Recovery Plan (USFWS 2002).;

- Policy 7.5.1.4 - Proposed rare, threatened, or endangered species preserves, as approved by the County Board of Supervisors, shall be designated Ecological Preserve (-EP) overlay on the General Plan land use map;
- Policy 7.4.1.5 - Species, habitat, and natural community preservation/conservation strategies shall be prepared to protect special status plant and animal species and natural communities and habitats when discretionary development is proposed on lands with such resources unless it is determined that the resources exist, and either are or can be protected, on public lands or private Natural Resource lands; and
- Policy 7.4.1.6 – All development projects involving discretionary review shall be designed to avoid disturbance or fragmentation of important habitats to the extent reasonably feasible. Where avoidance is not possible, the development shall be required to fully mitigate the effects of important habitat loss and fragmentation. Mitigation shall be defined in the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan.
- Policy 7.4.4.4: The County shall apply tree canopy coverage standards to discretionary permit review applicable to oak woodland habitats. Parcels having canopy cover by trees of at least 10 percent, as determined from base line aerial photography or by site survey performed by a qualified licensed arborist or botanist, are subject to canopy coverage retention or replacement standards shown in **Table 4**:

**TABLE 4  
TREE CANOPY RETENTION STANDARDS**

Percent Existing Canopy Cover	Canopy Cover to be Retained
80-100	60 % of existing canopy
60-79	70% of existing canopy
40-59	80% of existing canopy
20-39	85% of existing canopy
10- 19	90% of existing canopy
1-9 for parcels > 1 acre	90% of existing canopy

Listed and Special Status Species

Special-status species are plant and animal species that have been afforded special recognition by federal, state, or local resource agencies or organizations. Listed and special-status species are of relatively limited distribution and may require specialized habitat conditions. A Biological Resources Evaluation and Jurisdictional Delineation Report was prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc on April 28, 2005.

**TABLE 5  
SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES FOR WHICH SUITABLE HABITAT OCCURS IN THE PSA.**

Special Status Species	Common Name	Federal Status <sup>a</sup>	State Status <sup>a</sup>	Source <sup>b</sup>	Habitat Present? / Species Observed?
Amphibians					
<i>Rana aurora draytonii</i>	California red-legged frog	T	CSC	1	No/ No
Reptiles					
<i>Phrynosoma coronatum frontale</i>	California horned lizard	SC	CSC	1, 2, 3	Yes/ Yes
Natural Communities					
Gabbroic Northern Mixed Chaparral	--	--	--	3	Yes/ Yes
Red Willow Riparian Forest	--	--	--	3	Yes/ Yes
Plants / CNPS List					
<i>Calystegia stebbinsii</i>	Stebbins' morning-glory	E	E/ 1B	1, 2, 3	Yes/ Yes
<i>Ceanothus roderickii</i>	Pine Hill Ceanothus	E	R/ 1B	1, 2, 3	Yes/ Yes
<i>Chlorogalum grandiflorum</i>	Red Hills soaproot	SC	--/ 1B	1, 2, 3	Yes/ Yes
<i>Fremontodendron californicum</i> ssp. <i>decumbens</i>	Pine Hill flannelbush	E	R/ 1B	1, 2	Yes/ No
<i>Galium californicum</i> ssp. <i>sierrae</i>	El Dorado bedstraw	E	R/ 1B	1, 2	Yes/ No
<i>Helianthemum suffrutescens</i>	Amador (Bisbee Peak) rush-rose	SLC	--/ 3	1, 2, 3	Yes/ Yes
<i>Senecio layneae</i>	Layne's butterweed (ragwort)	T	R/ 1B	1, 2	Yes/ No
<i>Wyethia reticulata</i>	El Dorado County mule ears	SC	--/ 1B	1, 2, 3	Yes/ Yes

<sup>a</sup> **Listing Status** Federal status determined from USFWS letter. State status determined from DFG (2004a,c). Codes used in table are:

**E** = Endangered; **T** = Threatened; **P** = Proposed; **C** = Candidate; **R** = California Rare; \* = Possibly extinct.

**Other Codes** Other codes determined from USFWS letter; DFG (2004a); and CNPS (2001). Codes used in table are as follows:

**SC** = USFWS Species of Concern: Taxa for which existing information may warrant listing but for which substantial biological information to support a proposed rule is lacking.

**SLC**= Species of local or regional concern or conservation significance. An informal term used by some but not all U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service offices.

**CSC** = DFG Species of Special Concern; **FP** = DFG Fully Protected; **Prot** = DFG Protected

**CNPS List** (plants only): **1B** = Rare or Endangered (R/E) in CA and elsewhere; **3** = Need more information;

<sup>b</sup> **Sources** **1** = From USFWS letter. **2** = From CNDDDB/ RareFind. **3** = Observed by Sycamore Environmental.

IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

**Standards of Significance**

The significance criteria in the biological resources checklist are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. These criteria were developed to establish thresholds for determining the significance of impacts pursuant to CEQA (Section 15064.7) and should not be confused with “take” or an adverse effect under the ESA. The following impacts discussion is based upon the biological resources checklist at the beginning of this chapter and analyzes each of them under “a” through “f” in the following section.

Direct impacts are those, which directly destroy occupied or potentially suitable habitat for a part of a species’ life history or which causes mortality or injury.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

Review of the County’s Critical Habitat Area for the California Red-legged Frog notes that the parcel is neither within the critical habitat nor the designated core area for this protected species. The project is located within the Cameron Park unit of the Pine Hill Preserved, though outside of a designated ecological preserve under the General Plan. As such, a biological survey was required. The applicant has submitted a “Biological Resources Evaluation and Jurisdictional Delineation Report for 68 acre Cameron Park” prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. on April 28, 2005.

The Biological Evaluation concluded that there were several Special Status species and/or habitat located on the project site (Table 5). The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the project to make the impacts less than significant.

The following mitigation measures are required:

**Mitigation Measure 1:**

Grading and improvement plans shall state: “It is the Contractor’s responsibility to comply with all applicable state and federal laws and regulations including the Federal and State Endangered Species Acts and the Clean Water Act. The County Grading Permit does not authorize Contractor to conduct activities not permitted by applicable State and Federal agencies in areas subject to State and Federal jurisdiction.”

*Timing/Implementation: Review improvement plans*

*Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning*

**Mitigation Measure 2:**

- a. Twenty-four hours prior to construction activities, a qualified biologist will conduct a preconstruction survey for California horned lizard.
- b. All horned lizards found on the project site during the preconstruction survey will be relocated to the property west of the EID easement.
- c. A qualified biologist will be present on-site for all clearing and grubbing activities. All horned lizards found during clearing and grubbing will be relocated to the property west of the EID easement.

*Timing/Implementation: Prior to clearing and grubbing*

*Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning*

**Mitigation Measure 3:**

A qualified biologist will conduct a survey within 3 weeks prior to the start of grading, clearing, or other construction activities for active nests. The survey will be conducted within 200 ft of the project site.

- a. If no active nests are found, no further avoidance measures will be necessary.
- b. If an active nest is located within 200 ft of a construction area, the biologist will record the location(s) on a site map.
  - -If the species is listed under the federal or state endangered species acts, the appropriate federal or state agency will be contacted for guidance.
  - -If the species is not federal or state listed, but protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, the biologist will establish a minimum 100 ft buffer (Environmentally Sensitive Area) around the nest tree.
  - -The biologist will delimit the buffer zone with yellow caution tape, surveyor's flagging, pin flags, stakes, etc. The buffer zone shall be maintained until young have fledged. No construction activities shall occur within 100 ft of a nest tree while young are in the nest.
  - -A biologist will monitor the nest weekly during construction to evaluate potential disturbance caused by construction activities. The biological monitor will have the authority to stop construction if the nesting birds appear to be adversely affected by construction activities.

*Timing/Implementation: Prior to clearing and grubbing*

*Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning*

**Mitigation Measure 4:**

The landscaping plan must show that only plants associated with gabbroic northern mixed chaparral will be planted on graded slopes surrounding the project site.

*Timing/Implementation: Prior to clearing and grubbing*

*Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning*

**Mitigation Measure 5:**

Pay El Dorado County rare plant mitigation fee for Zone 1.

*Timing/Implementation: Prior to clearing and grubbing*

*Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning*

**Mitigation Measure 6:**

- a. Establish an on-site *Calystegia* Preserve north of the project site, adjacent to the Pine Hill Preserve.
- b. Transplant the four *Calystegia stebbinsii* from the project site to the *Calystegia* Preserve.
- c. Collect seeds of *Calystegia stebbinsii* from plants in project study area; treat seeds (scarify and/or heat treatments), and plant seeds or seedlings in the *Calystegia* Preserve.
- d. Remove chaparral shrubs from *Calystegia stebbinsii* transplant/seedling areas to encourage germination and growth of *Calystegia stebbinsii* plants

*Timing/Implementation: Prior to clearing and grubbing*

*Enforcement/Monitoring: El Dorado County Planning*

- b) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

See a) above. Sensitive habitats include those that are of special concern to resource agencies and those that are protected under CEQA, Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code, or Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. A 2081 CESA Take of Permit is required from the California Department of Fish and Game. The application has submitted the 2081 Application and is working with the Department of Fish and Game. This environmental document and mitigation measures contained in this document will be referenced in the Take Permit

- c) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?*

See discussion b) above. The total acreage of potential jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S. on the project site total 0.908 acre. The project design avoids impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U.S. The following mitigation measure is applied to the project.

**Mitigation Measure 7:**

- a. A qualified biologist will stake the ordinary high watermark (OHWM) of channels 1 and 2 adjacent to the project site.
- b. Contractor will install temporary, high visibility construction fencing five feet from the staked OHWM prior to clearing and grubbing activities commence.
- c. Contractor will remove the temporary fencing after the grading pad is completed and drainage, roads, and utilities are installed.

*Timing/Implementation: Prior to clearing and grubbing*

*Monitoring/Enforcement: El Dorado County Planning*

- d) *Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*

See a), b) and c) above. Construction activities that require the disturbance of trees and vegetation could cause direct impacts to nesting raptors and migratory birds. Removal of habitat at the project site would be considered a direct and significant impact if sensitive bird species were taken or deterred from traditional nesting locations. Construction could also result in noise, dust, increased human activity, and other indirect impacts to nesting raptors or migratory bird species in the project vicinity. Potential nest abandonment, mortality to eggs and chicks, as well as stress from loss of foraging areas would also be considered potentially significant impacts.

- e) *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

See a) through d) above. The project would require the removal of approximately 37 trees (23 live oaks, 13 grey pines, and 1 Fremont cottonwood). The project will retain 90% of the existing tree canopy. According to County guidelines, the ratio of removal to replacement of trees is 1:1. The preliminary landscape proposes planting hundreds of trees, in particular the planting of approximately 62 interior live oaks on the project site, which achieves the County's 1:1 replacement policy. The project will include the following mitigation:

**Mitigation Measure 8:** Prepare tree replacement plan showing the replacement of every inch diameter at breast height of tree removed from the site by planting the same number of inches of native oak trees on-site.

*Timing/Implementation: Prior to clearing and grubbing*

*Monitoring/Enforcement: El Dorado County Planning*

- f) *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?*

There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans that are applicable to the project area. The project would not affect implementation of the USFWS' adopted recovery plans for California Red-legged Frog or gabbro soil plants, both of which apply to portions of El Dorado County. Though the proposed project is located within the Sierra Nevada Foothills and Central Valley Recovery Unit identified in the USFWS Recovery Plan for the California Red-legged Frog, the project area lacks water features that could potentially provide suitable habitat. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of the California Red-legged Frog Recovery Plans. The project area is within the south portion of the Pine Hill formation; however, the Proposed Project does not conflict with any of the tasks identified in the implementation schedule of the recovery plan for gabbro soil plants, and the County has mitigated for potential disturbance to Pine Hill Endemic plant species throughout the county by creating the Pine Hill Preserve. The Pine Hill Preserve protects gabbro soils plants and would result in a less than significant impact to protected plant species with mitigation identified previously in this document.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.5</b>	<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>	Would the project:			
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project area is located within the “Motherlode” and was generally affected by the Gold Rush of the 1850s. The continual discovery of gold along the forks and tributaries of the American River established Green Valley Road, which is north of the project area, as a major travel route into El Dorado County and the Sierra. Several small mining camps arose in the vicinity, including Mormon Island, Folsom, Salmon Falls, and Clarksville. Beginning in the 1860’s, as mining activity began to diminish, agricultural communities began to develop in the area.

The proposed project is located in an area that is urbanized and has been previously disturbed by grading and development. There are no known cultural, archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources in the vicinity of the proposed project. For paleontological resources, files from the Museum of Paleontology at the University of California Berkeley were searched. The GeoRef database was also consulted for information relating to the Cameron Park region.

CEQA presents guidelines at Section 15064.5 and Section 21083.2 for the identification of historical resources and determining their historical significance. The area to be disturbed by the project does not include any cultural resources (e.g., prehistoric sites, historic sites, or buildings) that meet the CEQA criteria for consideration as historical resources or unique archaeological resources.

Based on the *Cultural Resources Assessment* prepared by Pacific Legacy, Inc., April 8, 2005, no cultural resources were identified as a result of a records search at the North Central Information Center. In addition, archaeological surveys performed on March 21 and 25, 2005 did not identify any historic or archaeological resources.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?*

As discussed above, there are no identified historical resources, as defined in Section 15064.5, located within the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on a historical resource.

- b) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?*

As discussed above, there are no identified historical or archaeological resources, as defined in Section 15064.5, located within the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on an archaeological resource. However, should a previously unidentified or unanticipated archaeological resource be discovered during project construction, the project would be subject to the provisions of the California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097.94 et seq., which protect Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods regardless of their antiquity, and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains. In addition to the mandatory compliance with the State regulations identified above, the project site plans also contain specific instructions and measures that must be adhered to by the project contractor should a potential cultural resource be discovered during construction activities.

- c) *Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?*

There are no identified unique paleontological resources or sites, or unique geological features located within the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on a unique paleontological resource or site, or a unique geological feature. Although it is possible a previously unidentified paleontological feature could be discovered during project construction, project construction plans would implement existing policies in CEQA for the protection of paleontological resources. These policies include stopping work in the vicinity of any paleontological resources and a determination of their significance made by a qualified paleontologist.

- d) *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

The proposed project would be subject to the provisions of the California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097.94 et seq., regarding the discovery and disturbance of human remains. It is not anticipated that any human remains would be encountered during construction of the proposed project. In addition to the mandatory compliance with the State regulations identified above, the project site plans also contain specific instructions and measures that must be adhered to by the project contractor should any human remains be discovered during construction activities. These instructions state that if unusual amounts of stone, bone, or artifacts are uncovered during construction, all work shall be stopped within one hundred feet (100') of the find, and a qualified archaeologist consulted for an on-site evaluation. If the bone appears to be human, the El Dorado County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted. Therefore, potential impacts from the proposed project are considered less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.6</b>	<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>	Would the project:			
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death, involving:				
i)	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv)	Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

### REGIONAL GEOLOGY

El Dorado County is located in the Sierra Nevada geomorphic province of California, which is east of the Great Valley province and west of the Range and Basin provinces. The Sierra Nevada province is characterized by steep-sided hills and narrow, rocky stream channels. This province consists of Pliocene and older deposits that have been uplifted as a result of plate tectonics, granitic intrusion, and volcanic activity. Subsequent glaciation and additional volcanic activity are factors that led to the east-west orientation of stream channels.

The southwestern foothills of El Dorado County are composed of rocks of the Mariposa Formation that include amphibolite, serpentine, and pyroxenite. The northwestern areas of the county consist of the Calaveras Formation, which includes metamorphic rock such as chert, slate, quartzite, and mica schist. In addition, limited serpentine formations are located in this area. The higher peaks in the county consist primarily of igneous and metamorphic rocks with granite intrusions, a main soil parent material at the higher elevations.

### SEISMICITY

Seismicity is defined as the geographic and historical distribution of earthquakes, or more simply, earthquake activity. Seismic activity may result in geologic and seismic hazards including seismically induced fault displacement and rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, lateral spreading, landslides and avalanches, and structural hazards. Based on historical seismic activity and fault and seismic hazards mapping, El Dorado County is considered to have relatively low potential for seismic activity, and is located beyond the highly active fault zones of the coastal areas of California. The County's fault systems and associated seismic hazards are described below.

### FAULT SYSTEMS

Earthquake activity is intrinsically related to the distribution of fault systems (i.e., faults or fault zones) in a particular area. The distribution of known faults in El Dorado County is concentrated in the western portion of the county, with several isolated faults in the central county area and the Lake Tahoe Basin. Fault systems mapped in western El Dorado County include the West Bear Mountains Fault; the East Bear Mountains Fault; the Maidu Fault Zone; the El Dorado Fault; the Melones Fault Zone of the Clark, Gillis Hill Fault; and the Calaveras–Shoo Fly Thrust. No active faults have been identified in El Dorado County. One fault, part of the Rescue Lineament–Bear Mountains fault zone, is classified as a well-located late-Quaternary fault (DOC 2000); therefore, it represents the only potentially active fault in the County. It is part of the Foothill Fault Suture Zone system, which was considered inactive until a Richter scale magnitude 5.7 earthquake occurred near Oroville on August 1, 1975 (DOC 1990). All other faults located in El Dorado County are classified as pre-Quaternary (inactive).

### SOILS

Soils located on jurisdictional lands on the west slope of El Dorado County consist of well-drained silt and gravelly loams divided into two physiographic regions, the Lower and Middle Foothills and the Mountainous Uplands (SCS 1974a). There are a total of eight soil associations in western El Dorado County. Five soil associations occur in the Lower and Middle Foothills region:

- Auberry-Ahwahnee-Sierra: Well-drained coarse sandy loams and sandy loams formed in material weathered from granitic rocks.
- Auburn-Argonaut: Well-drained silt loams and gravelly loams formed in material weathered from basic rocks and metasedimentary rocks.
- Boomer-Auburn: Well-drained silt loams and gravelly loams formed in material weathered from basic igneous rocks or metasedimentary rocks.

- Rescue: Well-drained sandy loams formed in material weathered from basic rocks.
- Serpentine Rock Land-Delpiedra: Excessively drained to somewhat excessively drained rock land and loams formed in material weathered from ultra-basic rocks.
- Three soil associations are present in the mountainous uplands:
- Cohasset-Aiken-McCarthy: Well-drained cobbly loams and loams formed in material weathered from volcanic conglomerate.
- Holland-Musick-Chaix: Well-drained coarse sandy loams and sandy loams formed in material weathered from granitic rocks.
- Mariposa-Josephine-Sites: Well-drained gravelly silt loams, silt loams, and loams formed in material weathered from metasedimentary rocks.

## DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) *Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death, involving:*

i) *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?*

There are no known faults crossing through the project site or in the vicinity of the project site. The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo earthquake hazard zone. The project would have a less than significant impact concerning fault rupture hazards.

ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

The project area is considered to be an area of low risk for seismic ground shaking. In addition, the County requires all new structures to be built in accordance with Seismic Zone criteria 3, as set forth in the Uniform Building Code (UBC), thereby reducing any seismic hazards. Therefore, the risk of adverse effects from ground shaking is considered to be less than significant.

iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

Liquefaction is most likely to occur in deposits of water-saturated alluvium or similar deposits of artificial fill. No areas of this type have been identified in El Dorado County; therefore, no impacts from liquefaction are anticipated.

iv) *Landslides?*

The project would not alter slopes or other areas where landslides would be likely; therefore, the likelihood of landslides is minimal and no impacts are anticipated.

b) *Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

All grading activities exceeding 250 cubic yards of graded material or grading completed for the purpose of supporting a structure must meet the provisions contained in the County of El Dorado *Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance* (Ordinance No. 3983). This ordinance is designed to limit erosion, control the loss of topsoil and sediment, limit surface runoff, and ensure stable soil and site conditions for the intended use in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan. The project site plans also include Best Management

Practices (BMP's) designed to reduce soil erosion. Specifically, these practices include watering down unpaved surfaces a minimum of four times daily, as well as at the end of the work shift, ensuring construction vehicle speeds of 15 mph or less, and moistening and/or securing tarps on soil piles. The project must also comply with the regulations identified in the Storm Water Master Plan for El Dorado County. Any grading that would occur as part of project construction would be subject to El Dorado County Air Quality Management District's current Fugitive Dust Rule 223- General Requirements (amended July 19, 2005) and Rule 223.1-Construction Activities (adopted July 19, 2005), which would serve to minimize dust and the loss of topsoil from project construction. As all grading must comply with the County ordinance and all County best management practices and policies, the project's contribution to erosion and loss of topsoil would be considered less than significant.

- c) *Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?*

The Rescue series soil types found on the project site (RgE2, RfC and ReB) is considered to be moderately stable soils. The construction of the project would not result in unstable earth conditions, significant changes to the geologic substructure or substantially change the topography. The project is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable. The project would not result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Therefore, no impacts from the proposed project are anticipated.

- d) *Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?*

Expansive soils are soils that increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise during each wet season and fall during each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows, which may result in structural hazards.

Expansive soils are directly related to areas with a high shrink-swell potential. Soil surveys typically rate shrink-swell potential in soils on a low, medium, and high basis. Generally, soils in western El Dorado County have a low to moderate shrink-swell potential. Data from the digital soil survey indicate that 68% of soils in western El Dorado County have a low or moderate shrink-swell rating, but only 0.01% have a high rating; the remaining areas are typically rock formations and are not rated (NRCS 2002). The project area is not identified as being in an area of expansive soils. As a result, this impact is considered less than significant.

- e) *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*

The project will utilize the public sewer system provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District. Neither septic tanks nor alternative wastewater disposal systems are part of the proposed project. Therefore, there is no impact associated with the proposed project.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.7</b>	<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>	Would the project:			
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g)	Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A material is considered hazardous if it appears on a list of hazardous materials prepared by a Federal, State, or local agency, or if it has characteristics defined as hazardous by such an agency. A hazardous material is defined in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) as follows:

*A substance or combination of substances which, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical or infectious characteristics, may either (1) cause, or significantly contribute to, an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible, or incapacitating reversible, illness; or (2) pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or environment when improperly treated, stored, transported or disposed of or otherwise managed. (California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66261.10)*

Chemical and physical properties cause a substance to be considered hazardous. Such properties include toxicity, ignitability, corrosivity, and reactivity. CCR, Title 22, Sections 66261.20-66261.24 define the aforementioned properties. The release of hazardous materials into the environment could potentially contaminate soils, surface water, and groundwater supplies.

Under Government Code Section 65962.5, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) maintains a list of hazardous substance sites. This list, referred to as the "Cortese List", includes CALSITE hazardous material sites, sites with leaking underground storage tanks, and landfills with evidence of groundwater contamination. In addition, the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department maintains records of toxic or hazardous material incidents, and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) keeps files on hazardous material sites.

Most hazardous materials regulation and enforcement in El Dorado County is overseen by the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department that refers large cases of hazardous materials contamination or violations to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the California State Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). It is not at all uncommon for other agencies such as the Air Pollution Control District and both the Federal and State Occupational Safety and Health Administrations (OSHA) to become involved when issues related to hazardous materials arise.

Several hazardous materials databases were searched to determine the potential for the presence of hazardous materials and hazardous waste in the project area. These databases are listed below.

### FEDERAL RECORD SOURCES

- NPL – National Priority List;
- CERCLIS – Comprehensive Environmental Response, compensation, and Liability Information System;
- CERCLIS-NFRAP – CERCLIS No Further Remedial Action Planned;
- RCRIS – Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System;
- ERNS – Emergency Response Notification System;
- BRS – Biennial Reporting System;
- ROD – Records of Decision;
- TRIS – Toxic Chemical Release Inventory System;

- SNAP – Superfund NPL Assessment Program Database;
- RCRA Info – Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Information;
- EPA’s Envirofacts – Environmental Protection Agency Envirofacts Database.

STATE RECORD SOURCES

- CAL-SITES – Contains potential or confirmed hazardous substance release properties;
- CORTESE – “Cortese” Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List;
- SWF/LF (SWIS) – Solid Waste Information System;
- LUST – Leaking Underground Storage Tank Information System;
- CA UST – Active Underground Storage Tank Facilities.

NATURALLY OCCURRING ASBESTOS

As discussed above in the Air Quality Section, serpentine rock, which may contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) is known to be present in the project region, though according to the County Environmental Management Department’s “Asbestos Review Areas” map, it is not likely to occur within the project area. Serpentine rock containing NOA can release NOA into the air when the rock is broken or crushed.

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

- a) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?*

The project is a congregate care facility and, as such, there will be a minimum of any hazardous materials or substances used during construction or remaining on the premises after construction. The proper use and storage of any hazardous material or substances should limit exposure and the potential for explosion or spills. If explosives are used for grading, such activity would only occur in conformance with State and County applicable laws. In this case the El Dorado County *Hazardous Waste Management Plan* serves as the implementation program for the management of any hazardous wastes in order to protect the health, safety, and property of residents in the vicinity of the project.

The removal of medical waste, such as used needles, from the site may require a Medical Waste Permit. The applicant will be required to seek a determination from Environmental Management as to whether a permit is required prior to building permit issuance. In the event a permit is not required, the applicant will be required to contract with either their waste management provider or the medical vendor for proper disposal of medical/hazardous waste. All hazardous material uses would be required to comply with all applicable local, state and federal standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials, therefore, these impacts are considered less than significant.

- b) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

Construction activities associated with the project would include refueling and minor maintenance of construction equipment on location, which could lead to minor fuel and oil spills. The use and handling of hazardous materials during construction activities would occur in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws including California Occupational Health and Safety Administration (CalOSHA) requirements. Should any fuel and/or oil spills occur, they would take place in areas where there are few residences or other land use activities sensitive to hazardous material releases, and these spills would likely be minor.

Additionally, as discussed in Air Quality, grading activities in certain areas of El Dorado County have the potential to release NOA into the air. Though the potential release of NOA could happen through normal construction activities (i.e., not just as a result of upset or accident conditions), it is addressed here since this checklist does not provide a specific focus on naturally occurring hazardous materials. As discussed in the Air Quality Section, any grading required for project construction would be subject to El Dorado County Air Quality Management District's current Fugitive Dust Rules 223, 223-1 and 223-2, as well as the requirements of Section 93105 which would serve to minimize asbestos release from project construction. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

In addition, the project will not result in any reasonably foreseeable upsets or accidents involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Chemicals for pool and spa maintenance to be stored and used onsite in quantities greater than 55 gallons for liquids, 500 pounds for solids, and/or 200 scf (standard cubic feet) for gasses will require an annual business plan to be submitted to Environmental Management's Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials Division (HazMat). If the facility uses gaseous chlorine, or liquid held under pressure in quantities greater than 100 pounds for pool maintenance, compliance with the State Office of Environmental Safety's California Accidental Release and Prevention (CalARP) provisions, including "Off-site Consequence Analysis" and "Worst Case Analysis", will be required.

- c) *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

There are no schools within one-quarter (0.25) mile of the project area. As discussed in the Air Quality section, minor amounts of dust and emissions from construction equipment would be released during project construction. However, these impacts would be minimal due to the limited nature of the project and short-term construction period. Additionally, any potential release of NOA due to grading activities would be minimal, and subject to control pursuant to the regulations identified in Question b, above.

- d) *Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

A hazardous materials list database search was conducted on May 18, 2006. The search found no hazardous materials sites within the project area, and it is unlikely that the project site would be affected by contamination from hazardous materials.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

Airports in El Dorado County subject to a comprehensive land use plan (CLUP) are located in Placerville, Cameron Park, and Georgetown. Of these, the closest is Cameron Park Airport, located approximately 1.5 miles from the project site.

Airport-related hazards are generally associated with aircraft accidents, particularly during takeoffs and landings. Airport operation hazards include incompatible land uses, power transmission lines, wildlife hazards (e.g., bird strikes), and tall structures that penetrate the imaginary surfaces surrounding an airport.

The proposed project would not include any structures or equipment anticipated to penetrate the navigable airspace of the Cameron Park Airport, nor would it interfere with the CLUP regulations for this facility; therefore, the impacts are considered to be less than significant.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

See discussion under e) above. The project is not in the vicinity of any private airstrips; therefore, there is no impact.

- g) *Would the project impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

The proposed project will not physically interfere with the implementation of the County adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan for the project area. The County emergency response plan is located within the County Office of Emergency Services located in the El Dorado County Government Center complex in Placerville.

- h) *Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?*

The project is located in an area of moderate hazard for wildland fire as identified on the El Dorado County Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). Based upon the location of the nearest fire station, availability of multiple access points to the project site, fire flow requirements for fire suppression and provisions within the County emergency response plan, impacts from wildland fire is less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.8</b>	<b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>	Would the project:			
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The proposed project area is located within the limits of unincorporated El Dorado County. The project area is located within the 1,265-square mile Cosumnes River watershed, which encompasses the southern region of El Dorado County, extending from its headwaters at the Iron Mountain Ridge in the Sierra Nevada, west to its confluence with the Sacramento River in Sacramento County (El Dorado County, 1998).

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

a) *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

The proposed project would consist of the construction of the development for the Cameron Park Congregate Care and Senior Village. A total of 204 units (140 units congregate care, 64 duet cottages, 35 patient

Alzheimer's unit), and a clubhouse building are proposed to be constructed on the site. In addition, Gabbert Drive will be extended to serve the site. The project would be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting program, which requires the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize water quality impacts from construction projects. BMPs applicable to the project are included in the project site plans, which are available for public review at the El Dorado County Department of Transportation. The project site plans include a series of required BMPs to ensure that water quality standards are not violated during construction and site grading activities. Required BMPs related to grading and drainage includes but are not limited to

- Adequate erosion control practices would be installed to ensure that sediment in excess of pre-project site conditions would not leave the project site.
- Areas involving extensive grading and shaping would require stockpiling and re-use of topsoil to provide adequate re-vegetation.
- The project engineer would identify erosive velocities in water conveyance structures. Where necessary, riprap or similar practices would be required.
- An erosion control plan would be reviewed with the Resource Conservation District and a County Department of Transportation representative.

Due to the use of BMPs as required by El Dorado County and the NPDES permit, construction activities associated with the improvements would cause less than significant impacts to water quality and would not violate any existing waste discharge requirements.

- b) *Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?*

The proposed project would not contain elements that add to or draw from groundwater. The project would result in negligible increases in impervious surfaces in the project area. However, this small increase in impervious surfaces would not impact the groundwater recharge rate. Less than significant impacts to groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge are anticipated.

- c) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*

Storm water infrastructure improvements are proposed as part of the project and include a detention structure of oversized underground pipes for the western portion of the site and detention ponds for the eastern portion of the site with flow control structures at each outlet to throttle the flow to the existing swale. As a result, a total of 53,579 cubic feet of water will be retained on site in order to keep the post-development drainage runoff to a pre-development level. The drainage for the project area would be collected in existing or realigned drainage inlets and conveyed in existing or realigned storm drain infrastructure in the direction of historic drainage. As a result, the proposed project would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns in the project site or area. The project would not take place in or near a stream or river, and, as discussed in question a), above, the project would be subject to the requirements of El Dorado County BMPs and NPDES permit requirements, which would minimize erosion and siltation from the project. Additionally, the project site plans include measures to control drainage and runoff from the site that must be adhered to by the project contractor. Therefore less than significant impacts to existing drainage patterns and off-site streams and rivers are anticipated.

- d) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?*

Refer to discussion c) above. Proposed storm water infrastructure improvements are designed to keep water drainage runoff to pre-development levels; therefore less than significant impacts to drainage patterns and flooding are anticipated.

- e) *Would the project create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*

Please reference question b) above. The project would cause a slight increase in the quantity of runoff generated in a storm event through the increase in impervious area associated with pavement surfaces. This increase would be contained within storm drains sized and constructed in accordance with El Dorado County standards. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant contribution to the amount and quality of storm water flows in the area.

- f) *Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

Please refer to questions a) through e) above. The project would be subject to the requirements of the El Dorado County BMPs and the requirements of the NPDES permit during construction in order to ensure that the project would not contribute to substantial degradation of water quality during construction or operation. This impact is less than significant.

- g) *Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?*

The FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map for the project area, (Panel No. 0725 C, December 4, 1986), establishes that the project site is not within a mapped 100-year floodplain, but within Flood Zone C “areas of minimal flooding”. Therefore, there would be no impact.

- h) *Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?*

See response to g) above. The proposed project would not impede or redirect any 100-year flood flows.

- i) *Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?*

See response to g) above. The project would not be subject to natural flooding or flooding due to the failure of a levee or dam; therefore, no impact related to floods or flooding is expected from this project.

- j) *Would the project be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?*

The project is not located near any ocean coast or seiche hazard area and no potential for mudflow is anticipated. A mudflow usually contains heterogeneous materials lubricated with large amounts of water often resulting from a dam failure or failure along an old stream course. The potential for a mudflow is considered to be non-existent. The project would not be subject to potential impacts involving seiche, tsunami, or mudflows.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.9</b>	<b>LAND USE AND PLANNING</b> Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

Land Uses within the project area are regulated by the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan. The proposed project is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, as well as with its designated land use development goals of the General Plan. The project area is urbanized and is surrounded by commercial and residential land uses.

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

a) *Would the project physically divide an established community?*

The proposed project is an assisted living facility and will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. The site is zoned for use through the special permit process and is compatible with residential, medical, and commercial uses in the surrounding area.

b) *Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

The proposed project is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, as well as with its designated land use development goals of the General Plan. Under the 2004 General Plan, Policy HO-4a allows and encourages the “development of affordable housing for seniors, including congregate care facilities.” Therefore, this is a less than significant impact.

c) *Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

No habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans are in place now or applicable to the project area. The project would have no impact with regard to these types of plans.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.10</b>	<b>MINERAL RESOURCES</b>	Would the project:			
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

El Dorado County is considered a mining region capable of producing a wide variety of mineral resources. Metallic mineral deposits, gold in particular, are considered the most significant extractive mineral resources. No mineral extraction activities occur within or in the vicinity of the project site. The project area is not within an area of known mineral resources as identified in the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan.

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

- a) *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*

The proposed project would not use or extract any mineral or energy resources and would not restrict access to known mineral resource areas. The proposed project would not conflict with energy conservation plans, use non-renewable resources in a wasteful manner or result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource; therefore, there would be no impact from the implementation of the proposed project.

- b) *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?*

See response to a) above. The project would have no impact on mineral resources.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.11</b>	<b>NOISE</b> Would the project result in:				
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

Of the existing noise sources in the area, the most prominent is traffic noise from U.S. Highway 50. Noise level criteria pertaining to project generated noise levels are contained within the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan Health, Safety, and Noise Element. The following is a summary of the Health, Safety, and Noise Element Goals, Objectives, Policies and Criteria, which are germane to this project. Policy 6.5.1.11 of the General Plan regulates construction noise.

**GOAL 6.5: ACCEPTABLE NOISE LEVELS**

Ensure that County residents are not subjected to noise beyond acceptable levels.

**Objective 6.5.1: Protection of Noise-Sensitive Development**

Protect existing noise-sensitive developments (e.g., hospitals, schools, churches and residential) from new uses that would generate noise levels incompatible with those uses and, conversely, discourage noise-sensitive uses from locating near sources of high noise levels.

Policy 6.5.1.9

Noise created by new transportation noise sources, excluding airport expansion but including roadway improvement projects, shall be mitigated so as not to exceed the levels specified in Table 6-1 at existing noise-sensitive land uses.

Table 6-1 of the El Dorado County Health, Safety, and Noise Element establishes an exterior noise level criterion of 60 dB Ldn at the outdoor activity area of residential land uses impacted by transportation noise sources. Where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 60 dB Ldn or less using a practical application of the best-available noise reduction measures, an exterior noise level of up to 65 dB Ldn may be allowed provided that available exterior noise level reduction measures have been implemented. In addition, an interior noise level criterion of 45 dB Ldn is applied to all residential land uses. The intent of this interior standard is to provide a suitable environment for indoor communication and sleep.

In addition to the El Dorado County noise level criteria, project related noise levels may be evaluated based upon a community’s response to the increase in the existing noise environment. **Table 6** is commonly used to show expected public reaction to changes in environmental noise levels. This table was developed on the basis of test subjects' reactions to changes in the levels of steady-state pure tones or broad-band noise and to changes in levels of a given noise source. It is probably most applicable to noise levels in the range of 50 to 70 dBA, as this is the usual range of voice and interior noise levels.

**TABLE 6**  
**SUBJECTIVE REACTION TO CHANGES IN NOISE LEVELS OF SIMILAR SOURCES,**  
**CAMERON PARK CONGREGATE CARE PROJECT**

<b>Change in Level, dBA</b>	<b>Subjective Reaction</b>	<b>Factor Change in Acoustical Energy</b>
1	Imperceptible (Except for Tones)	1.3
3	Just Barely Perceptible	2.0
6	Clearly Noticeable	4.0
10	About Twice (or Half) as Loud	10.0

Unless otherwise stated, all sound levels are reported in terms of A-weighted sound pressure levels, in decibels (dB). A-weighting de-emphasizes very low and very high frequencies of sound in a manner similar to the human ear. Most community noise standards utilize A-weighting, as it provides a high degree of correlation with human annoyance and health effects.

Policy 6.5.1.11

The standards outlined in Tables 6-3, 6-4, and 6-5 shall apply to those activities associated with actual construction of a project. Construction activities must occur between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on weekends, and on federally recognized holidays. Exceptions are allowed if it can be shown that construction beyond these times is necessary to alleviate traffic congestion and safety hazards.

Policy 6.5.1.12

When determining the significance of impacts and appropriate mitigation for new development projects, the following criteria shall be taken into consideration.

- A. Where existing or projected future traffic noise levels are less than 60 dB Ldn at the outdoor activity areas of residential uses, an increase of more than 5 dBA Ldn caused by a new transportation noise source would be considered significant;
- B. Where existing or projected future traffic noise levels range between 60 and 65 dB Ldn at the outdoor activity areas of residential uses, an increase of more than 3 dB Ldn caused by a new transportation noise source would be considered significant; and
- C. Where existing or projected future traffic noise levels are greater than 65 dB Ldn at the outdoor activity areas of residential uses, an increase of more than 1.5 dBA Ldn caused by a new transportation noise source would be considered significant.

J.C. Brennan & Associates, Inc. was contracted to conduct an acoustical noise analysis of current and future noise levels at the project site. J.C. Brennan & Associates, Inc., employs the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA RD-77-108) for the prediction of traffic noise levels. The FHWA model is the analytical method currently favored for traffic noise prediction by most state and local agencies, including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The model is based upon the CALVENO noise emission factors for automobiles, medium trucks and heavy trucks, with consideration given to vehicle volume, speed, roadway configuration, distance to the receiver, and the acoustical characteristics of the site. The FHWA Model was developed to predict hourly  $L_{eq}$  values for free-flowing traffic conditions, and is considered to be accurate within 1.5 dB in most situations. To predict  $L_{dn}$  values, it is necessary to determine the day/night distribution of traffic.

On November 30, 2005, J.C. Brennan & Associates, Inc., staff conducted short-term traffic noise level measurements on the project site and concurrent traffic counts on U.S. Highway 50. The purpose of the short-term traffic noise level measurements was to determine the accuracy of the FHWA model in describing the existing U.S. Highway 50 traffic noise levels at the project site, while accounting for shielding from excess ground attenuation, local topography, actual travel speeds, and roadway grade.

Noise measurement results were compared to the FHWA model results by entering the observed traffic volume, speed and distance as inputs to the FHWA model

Equipment used for the noise measurements included Larson Davis Laboratories (LDL) Model 820 precision integrating sound level meters. The meters were calibrated before and after use with an LDL CAL200 acoustical calibrator to ensure the accuracy of the measurements. The measurement system meets all pertinent specifications of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for precision sound level measurement equipment.

**TABLE 7  
COMPARISON OF FHWA MODELED TO MEASURED TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS**

Site	Vehicles/ Hr.			Posted Speed (mph)	Dist. (Feet)	Measured $L_{eq}$ , dB	Modeled $L_{eq}$ , dB*
	Time	Autos	Hvy.Trk.				
1	4:00 pm	624	18	65	925	57.1	60.5
1	4:10 pm	597	20	65	925	56.5	60.2

\* Acoustically "soft" site assumed.

Based upon the calibration results, the FHWA Model was found to over-predict U.S. Highway 50 traffic noise levels at the noise measurement location by approximately 3.5 dB. The difference in measured to modeled noise levels is due to excessive ground attenuation over a large distance, and intervening topography J.C. Brennan & Associates, inc., will apply a conservative -2 dB offset to the FHWA Model for the prediction of future U.S. Highway 50 traffic noise levels at the nearest outdoor activity areas of the project site.

## **DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

- a) *Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?*

### **CONSTRUCTION-RELATED NOISE**

Construction activities could increase noise levels temporarily in the vicinity of the project. Actual noise levels would depend on the type of construction equipment involved, distance to the source of the noise, time of day, and similar factors. However, these increases would be temporary and intermittent. Potential impacts related to construction-generated noise would be reduced to less than significant through compliance with El Dorado County General Plan Health, Safety, and Noise Element Policy 6.5.1.11. The El Dorado County Department of Transportation shall be responsible for enforcing this.

### **TRAFFIC-RELATED NOISE**

#### **Predicted Traffic Noise Levels**

The FHWA Model was employed to determine future U.S. Highway 50 traffic noise impacts upon the project site. Future traffic volumes were taken from the *Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)*, for the General Plan. The results include the -2 dB adjustment to the FHWA model as previously described.

Based upon the future U.S. Highway 50 traffic noise levels, the proposed project will be exposed to exterior noise level criterion for residential uses of at least 60 dBA Ldn at the nearest outdoor activity areas.

#### Discussion of Acoustical Shielding Provided By Buildings

Shielding can be expected at the individual outdoor patio areas due to the commercial and medical buildings adjacent to the project site. These shielding effects are discussed in the Caltrans Technical Noise Supplement (Section N-2144, Caltrans 1998 Technical Noise Supplement, TeNS).

J. C. Brennan & Associates, Inc., applied a conservative -5 dBA adjustment to account for shielding that will be provided by the commercial and medical facilities to the Congregate Care building and the Western Duet Cottage's outdoor activity areas. An adjustment of -3 dBA was applied to account for the partial shielding that would be provided by the medical facility to the outdoor activity areas of Duet Cottages located on the eastern portion of the project site.

While accounting for shielding, the predicted future traffic noise levels at proposed outdoor activity areas for the Cameron Park Congregate Care project are predicted to comply with the County's 60 dB Ldn standard.

#### Interior Traffic Noise Levels

To assess compliance with the 45 dB interior noise level standard for residential developments, it is necessary to determine the noise reduction provided by the building facade. This may be calculated by assuming a generalized A-weighted noise frequency spectrum, determining the composite transmission loss and resulting noise level in the receiving room, then correcting for room absorption and calculating the overall noise level in the room. Although construction details and floor plans were not available at the time of this analysis, extensive data exist on noise reduction performance of typical wall and window assemblies, which can be applied to this project.

Standard residential construction (wood siding or two-coat stucco siding, STC-26 windows, door weather stripping, exterior wall insulation, composition plywood roof, etc.), results in an exterior to interior noise reduction of about 25 dB with windows closed, and approximately 15 dB with windows open.

The analysis indicates that the nearest building facade adjacent to U.S. Highway 50 will be exposed to noise levels of approximately 59 dB Ldn at unshielded first floor facades. Therefore, interior traffic noise levels at unshielded first floor facades are predicted to comply with the 45 dB Ldn interior noise level criterion.

Second floor facades are predicted to be exposed to traffic noise levels approximately 2 to 3 dB higher (62 dB Ldn). This is due to the fact that second floor facades will not benefit from shielding due to barriers, and will not benefit from excess ground attenuation. Therefore, interior traffic noise levels at unshielded second floor facades are predicted to comply with the 45 dB Ldn interior noise level criterion provided standard residential construction practices are followed.

Based upon Policy 6.5.1.12 and the reported traffic noise level analysis, there would not be a significant increase in traffic noise levels associated with the project. Traffic noise levels associated with the Cameron Park Congregate Care Project are expected to comply with the El Dorado County General Plan noise level criteria.

- b) *Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

Potential groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels would most likely occur as part of construction activities associated with the project. These construction activities would be temporary in nature and would be subject to limited construction hours as outlined in Table 6-2 of the El Dorado County General Plan Health, Safety, and Noise Element to ensure less than significant impacts from construction-associated groundborne vibration and groundborne noise levels. The El Dorado County Department of Transportation shall be responsible for enforcing this.

- c) *Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

Refer to the analysis in discussion a) above. This impact is less than significant.

- d) *Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

Noise generated from equipment during construction activities would result in periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project area above existing levels. However these increases would be temporary, intermittent, and would be subject to limited construction hours as outlined in Policy 6.5.1.11 of the El Dorado County General plan Health, Safety, and Noise Element, to ensure less than significant impacts from construction-related noise.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

General Plan Policy 6.5.2.1 requires that all projects, including single-family residential, within the 55 dB/CNEL contour of a County airport shall be evaluated against the noise guidelines and policies in the applicable Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). In this case, the project site is not located within the defined 55dB/CNEL noise contour of a County owned/operated airport facility.

- f) *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

Refer to e) above. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.12</b>	<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING</b> Would the project:				
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The proposed project consists of the design and construction of the development for the Cameron Park Congregate Care and Senior Village. A total of 204 units (140 units of congregate care, 64 duets, 35 patient Alzheimer’s unit,) and a clubhouse building are proposed to be constructed on the site.

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

a) *Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

The proposed project includes the construction of 204 units of housing (64 duets and 140 units congregate care) including an Alzheimer Center and clubhouse building. Therefore, the project would contribute to a slight increase in population in the area. However, no population growth beyond what was already anticipated in the 2004 General Plan would occur as a result.

b) *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No structures or residential houses would be displaced as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and the project would have no impact on existing housing.

c) *Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

As discussed in b) above, the project would not involve the removal or relocation of any housing, and would therefore, not displace any people or necessitate the construction of any replacement housing.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.13 PUBLIC SERVICES</b> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The proposed project consists of the design and construction of the development for the Cameron Park Congregate Care and Senior Village. A total of 204 units of housing (64 duets units and 140 units of congregate care), an Alzheimer Center, and a clubhouse building are proposed to be constructed on the site. The El Dorado County Sheriff provides general public safety and law enforcement services for the project area. The Cameron Park/CDF Fire Department provides fire protection services and emergency services to the project area. Additionally, the County provides maintenance of public facilities, including the project area roadways.

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

a) *Fire protection?*

The Cameron Park Fire District currently provides fire protection services to the project area. Development of the project would result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection services. However, as no comments regarding the proposed project were received from the Fire District, it can be assumed that the project would not cause the level of service to fall below the minimum requirements. The established minimum level of service for the fire district in a Community Region is an 8-minute response to 80 percent of the population. The project site is within that response range through the existing fire station on Country Club Drive east of Cameron Park Drive. The project site has a security gate across all three access roads, possibly creating an impact on response times; however, the lack of comments from the Fire District implies no concerns on their part with the project. The standard gate requirements will be applied to the project so as to insure a less than significant impact on fire protection services. In addition, the Fire District will review the building permit plans to determine compliance with their fire standards, including, but not limited to: location of fire hydrants, accessibility around buildings, turning radii with parking lots, fire sprinklers within buildings, building identification and construction planning.

b) *Police protection?*

The project site will be served by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Department with a response time depending on the location of the nearest patrol vehicle. The minimum Sheriff's Department service standard is an 8-minute response to 80 percent of the population within Community Regions. Currently, the County has .89 sworn officers per 1,000 daytime population compared with a statewide average of 1.8 officers per 1,000 residents. However, this comparison is not valid based upon the large rural tracts in the County with sparse population, large concentrations of Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands, and an overall low crime rate. The Sheriff's Department stated goal is to achieve a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. The addition of the proposed congregate care facility and its related uses will not significantly impact the achievement of this goal, or significantly impact current response times to the project area.

*c) Schools?*

The proposed project is a congregate care/Alzheimer's facility; therefore the project would not result in an increased demand for schools.

*d) Parks?*

The proposed project is care facility and, as such, residents would generally stay on the premises. The number of residents that may utilize parks in the area is negligible and would not result in an increased demand for parks or governmental facilities to maintain parks.

*e) Other public facilities?*

The proposed project would not substantially increase the local population to a degree where acceptable service ratios would be adversely affected. The project would not create any significant impacts to the service levels of any other public service providers.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.14</b>	<b>RECREATION</b>				
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The El Dorado County Parks and Recreation Department serve the project area. However, no recreational facilities have been identified in the project area and there are no known plans to develop new recreational facilities in the project vicinity. The proposed project does not contain any features that would create additional recreation facilities outside the congregate care facility.

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

The proposed project would not create any new demand for any type of recreational facilities. Therefore, the project would have no impact on existing neighborhood and regional parks or other local recreational facilities.

b) *Does the project include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of existing facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

The proposed project would not require the expansion of recreational facilities, nor would it adversely affect the environment. Therefore, the project would have no impact on existing local recreational facilities.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The circulation system for El Dorado County consists of a roadway network that until recently, was primarily rural in character, but is rapidly urbanizing in the western portion of the County. U.S. Highway 50 is the primary transportation corridor connecting the County’s major population centers. Other State highways, County arterials, and a network of local public and private roads constitute the remainder of the roadway system.

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

a) *Would the project cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?*

Based upon a Traffic Impact Assessment performed February 7, 2005 by kdAnderson Transportation Engineers, the project could generate approximately 473 additional vehicle trips with 15 trips generated during the AM Peak-Hour and 38 trips generated during the PM Peak-Hour. Previous traffic studies regarding background traffic conditions in the El Dorado County area were researched to compare similar projects’ impact on traffic conditions. As a result of the traffic impact assessment it appears unlikely that the addition of

38 PM Peak-Hour trips would create an appreciable change in road conditions in the project area. The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in existing traffic trips on the roadway.

- b) *Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

Policy TC-XD of the 2004 General Plan establishes the LOS Standards for the County as follows: Policy TC-XD: Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions except as specified in Table TC-2 or, after December 31, 2008, Table TC-3. The volume to capacity ratio of the roadway segments listed in Tables TC-2 and TC-3 as applicable shall not exceed the ratio specified in that table. Level of Service would be as defined in the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, National Research Council) and calculated using the methodologies contained in that manual. Analysis periods shall be based on the professional judgment of the Department of Transportation, which shall consider periods including, but not limited to, Weekday Average Daily traffic (ADT), AM Peak Hour, and PM Peak Hour traffic volumes.

Based upon previous studies conducted by kdAnderson Transportation Engineers, the PM Peak-Hour traffic operated at LOS "F" at Cameron Park Drive and Palmer Drive. The Traffic Impact Assessment conducted for this proposed project projected approximately 38 additional trips during the PM Peak-Hour and, as such, would not create an appreciable change in traffic flows in the area or substantially impact County LOS Standards.

- c) *Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*

The proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns or increase traffic levels that would result in a substantial safety risk. The project does not propose any structures that would impede a height limitation in close proximity to an airport. Therefore, no impacts on air traffic patterns would occur as a result of this project.

- d) *Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

No design features such as sharp curves, dangerous intersections, turning radius, banking, or line of sight are present within the existing project limits. The proposed project would not include any of the above non-standard design features. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

- e) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

The project contractor would be required to prepare a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) for construction activities to ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles during project construction. The proposed project would improve traffic flows through the intersection, which would improve emergency access in the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on emergency access.

- f) *Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?*

No land uses are proposed that would generate a demand for parking outside the care facility. The proposed project would not cause the loss of on-street parking spaces. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on parking capacity.

- g) *Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*

As discussed in Land Use, the proposed project is consistent with the development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, as well as with its designated land use development goals of the General Plan. The proposed project does not conflict with any policies, plans, or programs associated with alternative transportation and therefore would have no impact.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.16</b>	<b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>	Would the project:			
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g)	Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Utilities located in and surrounding the project area include water services provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID), electricity provided by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E), and telephone services provided by SBC Communications. Solid waste services in the project area are provided by El Dorado Disposal Service, Inc. El Dorado County maintains storm drainage facilities.

### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*

Wastewater uses at the site would not require special types of treatment and would be treated in the same manner as other domestic wastewater in the area. Currently, there is an 8-inch sewer line in Gabbert Drive.

There is also a 6-inch sewer line in Kevin Street, near the southern end of the property line. According to a letter from the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) dated February 8, 2006, these sewer lines have adequate capacity to handle the proposed project's sewer needs. In order to receive service from these lines, an extension of facilities of adequate size must be constructed. The extension of sewer lines would be in accordance with state and local requirements as well as be constructed according to the projected capacity demand. The addition of project-generated wastewater will not exceed or violate any wastewater treatment requirements and would be required to meet County.

- b) *Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

The project would result in a slight increase in water demand; however, no new water or wastewater treatment facilities will result from implementation of the proposed project. The water conveyance infrastructure in the project area is operated by the EID. According to a letter from the EID dated February 8, 2006, a 16-inch water line exists on Gabbert Drive and would serve the proposed project. In addition, a 10-inch water line extension from the 16-inch water line in Gabbert Drive to the 8-inch water line in Kevin Street must be constructed to access water supply as well as maintain adequate water pressure for fire hydrant purposes. The project would have no impact related to the construction of water or wastewater treatment facilities. This impact is considered less than significant.

- c) *Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

Refer to Hydrology and Water Quality for a full discussion of storm water drainage facilities. The project will implement County-approved BMPs to minimize impacts to hydrology and water quality. The BMPs that will be used for the proposed project include the construction of detention ponds for the eastern portion of the site with flow control structures at each outlet to throttle the flow to the existing swale. The construction of detention ponds will not result in significant impacts to the environment. This is considered a less than significant impact.

- d) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?*

The proposed project would utilize existing County water supplies provided by EID. The EID has indicated that there is sufficient water supply available in the area to serve the anticipated project demand. The proposed project would not generate a significant new demand for water and would not require additional or expanded entitlements. This impact is less than significant.

- e) *Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*

Please refer to discussion a) above. EID has indicated there is sufficient capacity to serve the proposed project's needs. There is a less than significant affect to the wastewater treatment provider.

- f) *Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?*

Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in the generation of significant volumes of solid waste. Solid waste disposal would occur in accordance with federal, state and local regulations. Disposal would occur at permitted landfills. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate the need for new solid waste facilities and the project's impacts would be considered less than significant.

The landfill's capacity would not be exceeded by the amount of solid waste generated at the project site. There is no impact.

g) *Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

The proposed project would conform to all applicable state and federal solid waste regulations, therefore, there would be no impact.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3.17 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b> Would the project:				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

a) *Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?*

There is no substantial evidence contained in this document that the project will have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. The project does not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of California history or pre-history. Any potentially significant impacts can be mitigated through the incorporation of the proposed mitigation measures and existing standards and requirements.

- b) *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.*

The project has impacts that are limited to the project site, the significance of which will be reduced by mitigation measures incorporated into the project. The project does not have any impacts which are considered to be cumulatively considerable.

- c) *Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

The project does not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The project includes mitigation which have been incorporated into the project.

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCE LIST

The following documents are available at El Dorado County Planning Services in Placerville.

*2004 El Dorado County General Plan*

*El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*

*Volume I - Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report*

*Volume II - Response to Comment on DEIR*

*Volume III - Comments on Supplement to DEIR*

*Volume IV - Responses to Comments on Supplement to DEIR*

*Volume V - Appendices*

*El Dorado County General Plan - Volume I - Goals, Objectives, and Policies*

*El Dorado County General Plan - Volume II - Background Information*

*Findings of Fact of the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors for the General Plan*

*El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance (Title 17 - County Code)*

*County of El Dorado Drainage Manual (Resolution No. 67-97, Adopted March 14, 1995)*

*County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Ordinance No. 3883, amended Ordinance Nos. 4061, 4167, 4170)*

*El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards*

*El Dorado County Subdivision Ordinances (Title 16 - County Code)*

*Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California*

*California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.)*

*Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3, Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (Section 15000, et seq.)*

L:\PC\AZS\A06-0003 Z05-0008 P05-0014 Initial Study.doc